

NEED OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY IN IRAQ

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to address the situation in Iraq. Right now, America is bearing the primary burden in Iraq. Almost every day another soldier dies—not in combat but in postwar occupation. Our American soldiers must not bear this burden alone. Quite frankly, the American taxpayer must not bear responsibility for the cost of nation building alone.

I urge our President, President Bush, to build an international effort to participate in sharing the burden and the responsibility of bringing order out of chaos in Iraq.

The occupation of Iraq is something we all have to face up to. Last year, when the Senate debated the Iraq war resolution, I said this: We do not know whether our troops will be welcomed with flags or with land mines.

Now we know. Our troops are facing great and grave danger. They are facing snipers, ambush. One soldier was shot in the back as he waited to buy a soda. Another was standing in line to buy DVDs, and he was shot in the back. This is not combat with an opposing army. These are murders, these are assassinations, and we need to stand up for our troops and give them the help and the backing they need.

We need to stand up for these troops who are so dedicated, so duty driven, so wanting to do the job that America sends them to do, but they should not bear this all by themselves, with a few treasured allies.

Since the President declared the end of hostilities, 82 soldiers have died. Our troops in Iraq are not peacekeepers or nation builders. There is no peace to keep and there is no nation to build. We have to start from scratch. America's troops now are an occupying force, and they continue to face very fierce resistance in parts of Iraq. In some areas, it is guerilla war with house to house fighting with members of the Saddam Fedayeen or other groups still loyal to Saddam Hussein trying to kill them. They are trying to ambush our military convoys.

Our forces are seeking to establish order and security. Yet they are very highly visible, whether they are guarding facilities such as power stations or delivering supplies or training the Iraqi police force. This puts them at grave risk. American soldiers must not face this danger all alone.

About 148,000 American soldiers are still serving in Iraq, and we salute them. There are over 13,000 troops from the United Kingdom, Australia, Poland, and other countries, and we thank them for being there. Many Marylanders are serving there, including members of our National Guard and Reserves, and I stand up for them to make sure they get the backup they need and they can return home from their deployment.

America should not stand with just a coalition of the few. We need to have the international force of the many.

This is why we need to go to the U.N. and ask for help. We need to go to NATO and get them involved, and we need to go to the world to help pay for the cost of doing this.

Occupying Iraq is not easy and it is not cheap. Rumsfeld has now doubled his estimates of the cost of occupying Iraq, from \$2 billion a month to \$4 billion a month. The Pentagon estimates that the total cost will be over \$100 billion. The American taxpayers are bearing that responsibility, and they will bear that responsibility for some time to come. When we talk about responsibility, it should be the responsibility of the world to help rebuild the power stations while we are trying to work to create a new power structure.

Last week I supported a burden sharing amendment to the State Department authorization bill. Ninety-seven Senators agreed to that. Not one disputed it. What did it recommend? That the President ask NATO to raise a military force for deployment in postwar Iraq, and to urge NATO allies and other nations to provide troops and police to the coalition efforts in Iraq, and that the President should call on the United Nations to urge its member states to provide military forces and civilian police to promote stability and security in Iraq.

It also said go to the U.N. to ask for resources to rebuild and administer Iraq. Iraqi oil alone will not pay for this. We have to get these oil wells ready.

When the President asked for authorization to go to war, I said that if it is important enough to go to war, if it is important enough to the world to go to war, then the world should come with us.

We must bring the entire international community with us to share responsibilities and the burden of stopping these threats.

I saw the situation we are in coming. That is what I worried about, that American troops would be there by themselves, with a few steadfast allies, and the American taxpayer would be the one facing this nation building. That was my position then and it is still my position.

During the debate in the Senate, I urged the Senate to support the Levin amendment, which called for international legitimacy, for international cooperation, international support, including military and international resources, meaning real money. I spoke on the Senate floor about the threat of Saddam Hussein, and I spoke about the threats to our troops. I said then that I firmly believed Saddam Hussein was duplicitous, deceptive, and dangerous and that they had grim and goulsh means to carry out their weapons plans. I did believe that they could develop, produce, and stockpile chemical and biological weapons, and I did believe that they had the means for delivering them in the region. Whether the information I was given in all my briefings was valid or not is something to probe in another forum. We are committed to doing that.

Right now, we need to acknowledge Saddam threatened not only the United States, he threatened the region and he threatened the world. Now the region and the world have to get into this. It is not too late. President Bush should mount a new diplomatic effort, recruiting allies to share these burdens of occupying Iraq and to root out the remaining resistance. We have to go to the U.N. and NATO to get formal authorization, get international help for this rebuilding. This is an opportunity to reach out, even to countries that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, and get them involved.

I hope we can answer this call before the Iraqi resistance fight grows, before more American soldiers die, without sending more troops into Iraq by getting our allies to join. If our allies join, they can help provide the troops, they can help provide the police, and they can help provide the money.

To our troops—regular, reserve, and their families—I say thanks. Thanks for helping get rid of Saddam Hussein and his regime. They were international thugs. They have made tremendous sacrifices. Each and every member of our military is part of this American family. We thank them for their bravery, their fortitude, and their gallantry. They answered the call to duty. I salute every single member of our Armed Forces.

I express my condolences to all Marylanders who lost their lives and paid the ultimate sacrifice. Captain Rippitoe, CPL Mark Evnin, SGT Kendall Waters Bey, PFC Juan Guadalupe, SP George Mitchell, and CPL Jason Mileo. I honor these men and their families, all the Marylanders wounded, and every American soldier right now either in Baghdad or in a hospital recovering.

Our troops know we count on them. They have to count on us to get them the help they need, not only with the right resources for our military but to get more military from other nations to support them. The international community was divided over whether to go to war in Iraq. Now the world should unite in support of winning the peace our American men and women have fought so hard to win and for which they have given so many sacrifices.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I join with Senator MIKULSKI in her comments expressing concern about the United States role in Iraq, the safety of our troops in Iraq, and how proud we are of our troops. I urge the administration to do what is necessary to restore morale. The best way is to do the right thing by our troops, make sure they are strongly supported and, even more fundamentally, rethink our position in Iraq: What is our policy? What are we attempting to accomplish? Then encourage many more of our allies, both in the Arab world and other parts of the world, to join the United States.

This is a problem that will only be resolved with more thoughtfulness and more direct candor about the nature of the problem and working closely with our allies, both Arabs and others.

We should also focus a little bit more on terrorism generally rather than get diverted, as we seem to be, in specific countries. It is extremely complex, but there is building concern in the United States about United States policy in Iraq. I join those who believe we should focus more on terrorism around the world. This requires the cooperation of a lot more countries around the world to be successful. I hope we can accomplish that.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 10 a.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2330, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2330) to sanction the ruling Burmese military junta, to strengthen Burma's democratic forces and support and recognize the National League of Democracy as the legitimate representative of the Burmese people, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). There is 1 hour of debate equally divided in the usual form with no amendments to the bill.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Burma sanctions bill. This bill is the result of a collaborative effort between Senators MCCONNELL, GRASSLEY and myself.

When first introduced, the bill would have imposed sanctions without an opportunity for congressional review. I was concerned that Congress would simply pass a bill, and then forget about Burma.

I think that is the wrong approach when it comes to sanctions.

Senator GRASSLEY and I worked hard to ensure that Congress would have the opportunity to revisit this issue every year. The House went even further, by requiring an annual vote, plus a 3-year sunset.

Now, make no mistake about it, the actions by the dictatorship in Burma are unacceptable. The arrests and treatment of Aung San Suu Kyi are deplorable and cannot be tolerated.

Yet as is so often the case when we debate the merits of international sanctions, the question is not whether to punish Burma's ruling regime; the question is how to do so effectively.

We have learned through our own experiences that unilateral sanctions simply don't work. They rarely desta-

bilize the oppressive regime that is the target of the sanctions. Instead, they only hurt the people—both in the target country and even here in the United States.

Unfortunately, we have also seen how, once a sanctions policy is in place, it is very difficult—no matter how ineffective the policy is, to terminate it and find a better solution.

So, how do we deal with this dilemma?

The answer is found in a simple appeal to common sense.

First, we must actively seek the cooperation of our allies. Multilateral action is essential if the policy is to be effective. Second, we must give ourselves a chance to review and revise the policy if it isn't working.

That is what this bill does with Burma. It imposes sanctions. It also encourages the president to work with our allies in the region to build a collective response. And I understand our allies are considering sanctions.

This bill also requires Congress to revisit the issue every year. If the policy is working, then we can renew it. But if it isn't working, then we can terminate it and try a new policy. This legislation will keep the dictatorship's feet to the fire. It will create regular incentives for them to change.

It is just this sort of common-sense approach that is needed with other U.S. sanctions, particularly against Cuba.

By any honest assessment, our embargo against Cuba—now in its fifth decade—is a total failure. The U.S. is alone in pursuing this failed policy, yet politics prevents us from reassessing it.

Thus, the Cuban embargo has become institutionalized. And the fight to end the embargo, even though ending it makes so much sense, has become a difficult, uphill battle.

We do not want that to happen to the Burma sanctions. We want the people of Burma to enjoy true democracy and freedom. And we want to pursue the policy that will help them achieve this. So we will try sanctions. But if they don't work, and if we are not joined by our allies in this cause, then Congress will revisit this issue in a year.

In the coming weeks, many Members will be pressing for action to reform Cuba sanctions. I hope that today's debate on Burma highlights the inconsistency of our sanctions policy, and that we can apply a common-sense approach as we move forward on other sanctions issues.

I now would like to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

IRAQ INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Montana who as always is representing issues that make an enormous difference to the quality of our debates here on the Senate floor but, more important, to how our world works, both here at home and abroad. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I rise today to join in a growing expression of concern by my colleagues and the American people about the possible misrepresentation of intelligence information by the President and the administration in building its case for the war in Iraq. Without a thorough explanation of why many of the administration's statements are in conflict, and have included claims unsubstantiated by the best intelligence, the American people, their representatives, and many of our would-be international partners in post-conflict Iraq, will most certainly begin to lose confidence in the administration's word. Simply, the Nation's credibility, in my view, is at stake.

That credibility is vital as we approach burden-sharing efforts in the reconstruction and democratization of Iraq, the projected cost of which grows each and every day.

There were reports again this morning that another American soldier lost his life in that reconstruction and democratization effort. All told, in New Jersey there have been seven men and women who have lost their lives in Iraq. We are paying a serious toll, not only in terms of financial expense, as recently reported, but, most importantly, in the life and blood of our brave soldiers.

A thorough public review is necessary, in my view, if we are to reestablish the United States' credibility. And once all the facts come to light, we need to hold those responsible accountable. Our leaders need to promptly admit and correct all misstatements, exaggerations, and overreaching interpretations.

On the White House Web site, the pages that relate to the conflict of Iraq are titled "Denial and Deception." The American people can only hope that is not a moniker for the administration's presentation of its case for the war in Iraq.

As we are now all well aware, in this year's State of the Union Address President Bush said:

The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

The power of the President's allegations in those 16 short words cannot be overstated. The Bush administration, using legalistic language, was leading people to embrace, at least in my view, the view that Saddam Hussein had an active nuclear program. The President didn't say the British were claiming anything. He didn't say they alleged anything. He said they "learned" that Saddam was attempting to buy uranium, implicitly accepting the charge as fact.

Although just 16 words long, it was a powerful statement that resonated in the context of debates that had gone on throughout the Nation and the world. Only much later did we the people and the Congress learn this statement was based on information that our own intelligence agency earlier learned was false.